



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/836,222	04/18/2001	Yoshihiro Nakagawa	1080.1096/JDH	6419
21171	7590	12/28/2005	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005				PATEL, HARESH N
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2154		

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/836,222	NAKAGAWA, YOSHIHIRO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Haresh Patel	2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 April 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-9 are subject to examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 9/28/2005, pages 6-9, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejection of claims 1-9 is maintained.

Applicant argues (1), "Independent claim limitations as amended recites, storing information of the users in association with information disclosure items... correspondingly assigned by the users and transmitting information corresponding to the information disclosure items of a specific user responsive to an information disclosure procedure matching the assigned information disclosure procedure corresponding to the specific user, which, the cited references, Alisuang and Black do not teach or suggest".

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The limitations, "storing information of the users in association with information disclosure items... correspondingly assigned by the users and transmitting information corresponding to the information disclosure items of a specific user responsive to an information disclosure procedure matching the assigned information disclosure procedure corresponding to the specific user", has been newly added, which is addressed by the new ground(s) of rejection (please refer to the below rejections of this office action. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Applicant argues (2), "limitations as amended recites, corresponding individual information and corresponding information disclosure items of each individual, where the information disclosure items are assigned by a corresponding individual. This enables

transmission of "the individual information corresponding to the information disclosure items of the specific individual when the assigned information disclosure procedure is satisfied", which, the cited art do not teach or suggest".

The examiner respectfully disagrees in response to applicant's arguments. The limitations, "corresponding individual information and corresponding information disclosure items of each individual, where the information disclosure items are assigned by a corresponding individual. This enables transmission of "the individual information corresponding to the information disclosure items of the specific individual when the assigned information disclosure procedure is satisfied", has been newly added, which is addressed by the new ground(s) of rejection (please refer to the below rejections of this office action. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Drawings

3. New corrected drawings are required in this application because Figures 1-14, do not show claimed invention, i.e., "the information disclosure items being correspondingly assigned by the users", "transmitting information corresponding to the information disclosure items of a specific user among the users responsive to an input of an information disclosure procedure matching the assigned information disclosure procedure corresponding to the specific user", "allowing the first user to assign a corresponding disclosure procedure", "executing a corresponding disclosure procedure assigned to an item of the information", "making the item accessible by the second user". Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in

reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled -- Replacement Sheet-- in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 9 mentions, “using which each item”, “item accessible by the second user”, which should be -- using each item --, and -- item accessible to the second user --, respectively.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9 recites the limitations, “the item”, “the information”, “the corresponding disclosure procedure”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim

(Please see MPEP 706.03(d)). Since, multiple “items” (an item of the information, each item of the information is to be accessed), multiple “information” (managing information of users, information managing device, storing information of a first user), and multiple “corresponding disclosure procedure” (first user to assign a corresponding disclosure procedure using which item, a corresponding disclosure procedure assigned to an item) exist in the claim, it is not clear which “item”, “information” and “corresponding disclosure procedure”, is referred by the limitations in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 2 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turner et al. US Publication 2003/0177030, Sep 18, 2003 (Hereinafter Turner) in view of Walker et al., 6,302,844 (Hereinafter Walker), Alisuag 2002/0083192 (Hereinafter Alisuag) and Marchosky, U.S. 2002/029157 (Hereinafter Marchosky).

8. As per claim 1, Turner discloses an individual information managing device (e.g., col.,2, paragraph, 0022) connected to a communication line network (e.g., col.,2, paragraph, 0022), for managing individual information (e.g., col., 2 paragraph 22 – col., 3 paragraph 30) the device comprising:

an individual information storing section in which corresponding individual information (e.g., paragraph, 0022) and corresponding information disclosure items (e.g., col.,2, paragraph, 0022), of each individual is registered (e.g., col.,2, paragraph, 0022),

a disclosure procedure storing section in which an information disclosure procedure assigned for each individual by each individual is registered; and (e.g., col., 2 paragraph 22 – col., 3 paragraph 30),

a disclosure procedure executing section (e.g., col., 2, paragraph, 19, paragraph, 23, col., 2) that receives a request for disclosing individual information a specific individual through the communication line network (e.g., usage of server 12 for information management, col., 2, paragraph, 19, paragraph, 23, col., 2),

executes an information disclosure procedure (e.g., figure 8, paragraph, 42, col., 5) matching the information disclosure procedure of the specific individual stored in the disclosure procedure storing section (e.g., figure 8, paragraph, 42, col., 5),

and transmits the individual information corresponding to the information disclosure items of the specific individual (e.g., col.,2, paragraph, 0022) to the communication line network toward an information requesting origin when the information disclosure procedure is satisfied (e.g., paragraph, 24, col., 2).

However, Turner does not specifically mention about having prepared information for each specific individual.

Walker discloses the concept of having prepared information for each specific individual (e.g., patient preference ranking related to the patient record, col., 14, lines 1 – 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Turner with the teachings of Walker in order to facilitate usage of prepared information for each specific individual because the prepared information would support providing service to the individual based on the individual's needs.

However, Turner and Walker do not specifically mention about the procedure being provided by each user.

Alisuag discloses the concept of the procedure being provided by each user (e.g., paragraph 12, col., 1, different user providing information, and usage of passcode if patient is conscious, usage of fingerprint if patient is unconscious, figures 1-3 and 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Turner and Walker with the teachings of Alisuag in order to facilitate the procedure being provided by each user because the procedure would support providing service to the user based on each user needs. The information related to the procedure would enhance managing information for the individual.

However, Turner, Walker and Alisuag do not specifically mention about the items being assigned by a corresponding individual and the information disclosure procedure being prepared by each individual.

Marchosky discloses the well-known concept of the items being assigned by a corresponding individual (paragraph 22) and the information disclosure procedure being prepared by each individual (paragraph 22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Turner, Walker and Alisuag with the teachings of

Marchosky in order to facilitate the items being assigned by a corresponding individual and the information disclosure procedure being prepared by each individual because the individual would have control on what items to be assigned and what items note to be assigned for the information disclosure procedure. The individual would prepare information disclosure procedure according to his/her own needs which would be used by the information managing device.

9. As per claim 2, Turner, Walker, Alisuag and Marchosky disclose the claimed limitations as disclosed above. Turner also discloses the individual information storing section is registered with each individual information including a plurality of ranked pieces of information for each individual (e.g., figures 1 and 3), based on an arrangement that each individual assigns a rank to each of the plurality of ranked pieces of information that constitute the individual information from among a, plurality of ranks (e.g., figures 1 and 3),

the disclosure procedure storing section is registered with an information disclosure procedure according to each rank within each individual assigned by each individual (e.g., figures 1 and 3), and the disclosure procedure executing section receives the request for disclosing the information of the specific individual (e.g., figure 3), and executes an information disclosure procedure stored in the disclosure procedure storing section matching an information disclosure procedure corresponding to a rank for the information of the specific individual of which disclosure request is received (e.g., col., 2, paragraph, 19).

10. As per claim 4, Turner, Walker, Alisuag and Marchosky disclose the claimed limitations as disclosed above. Turner also discloses the disclosure procedure storing section is registered with a posting procedure assigned by each individual for posting to an individual (e.g., col., 4 paragraph 36 – col., 5 paragraph 39), as a part of an information disclosure procedure for each individual, the disclosure procedure executing section has a disclosure request posting section that receives the request for disclosing the corresponding information of the specific individual (e.g., col., 4 paragraph 36 – col., 5 paragraph 39), posts to the specific individual that there has been a request for disclosing the corresponding individual information, in a posting procedure that matching a corresponding posting procedure of the specific individual stored in the disclosure procedure storing section (e.g., col., 4 paragraph 36 – col., 5 paragraph 39), and receives an approval for the individual information disclosure from the individual who received the posting (e.g., col., 4 paragraph 36 – col., 5 paragraph 39), and the disclosure procedure executing section receives an approval for the individual information disclosure from the disclosure request posting section, and proceeds with the information disclosure procedure (e.g., paragraph, 8, FIG. 6, FIG. 7, col., 4 paragraph 36 – col., 5 paragraph 39).

11. As per claims 5 and 6, Turner, Walker, Alisuag and Marchosky disclose the claimed limitations as disclosed above. Turner also discloses the disclosure procedure storing section is registered with an authentication procedure assigned by each individual for authenticating each individual (e.g., paragraph, 25, col., 2) as apart of an information disclosure procedure for each individual, the disclosure procedure executing section has an authenticating section (e.g., paragraph, 25, col., 2) after the disclosure procedure executing section has received an approval

for the corresponding individual information disclosure of the specific individual from a disclosure request posting section (e.g., paragraph, 25, col., 2).

However, Turner, Walker, Alisuag and Marchosky do not specifically mention about usage of corresponding authentication procedure.

Marchosky discloses a well-known concept of an authenticating section that receives the request for disclosing the corresponding individual information of the specific individual (e.g., paragraph, 22) and authenticates the specific individual an authentication procedure matching a corresponding authentication procedure of the specific individual stored in the disclosure procedure storing section (e.g., paragraph, 22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Turner, Walker, Alisuag and Marchosky in order to facilitate usage of an authenticating section that receives the request for disclosing the corresponding individual information of the specific individual and authenticates the specific individual an authentication procedure matching a corresponding authentication procedure of the specific individual stored in the disclosure procedure storing section because the individual would have control on what items to be assigned and what items note to be assigned for the authentication procedure. The individual would prepare information for the authentication procedure according to his/her own needs which would be used by the information managing device.

12. As per claim 7, Turner, Walker, Alisuag and Marchosky disclose the claimed limitations as disclosed above. Turner also discloses the disclosure procedure storing section can be freely

registered with an authorized person having a right of proceeding with an information disclosure procedure on behalf of the specific individual is transferred for each individual (e.g., col., 3, paragraph, 26), the disclosure procedure executing section receives the request for disclosing individual information of the specific individual (e.g., col., 3, paragraph, 26), and executes an information disclosure procedure of the specific individual stored in the disclosure procedure storing section matching an information disclosure procedure of the authorized person as a procedure for disclosing the corresponding individual information of the specific individual (e.g., col., 3, paragraph, 26), when the disclosure procedure storing section is registered with the authorized person having the right of proceeding with the information disclosure procedure on behalf of the specific individual is transferred (e.g., col., 3, paragraph, 26).

13. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turner in view of Walker, Alisuag and Marchosky and Platenghe, Cris. T European patent application, EP 0950972, 4/14/1999 (Hereinafter Platenghe).

14. As per claim 3, Turner, Walker, Alisuag and Marchosky disclose the claimed limitations as disclosed above. Turner also discloses the disclosure procedure storing section is registered with an information disclosure procedure at a normal time for each individual assigned by each individual (e.g., paragraph, 23).

However, Turner, Walker, Alisuag and Marchosky do not specifically mention about handling a request at an emergency time.

Platenghe discloses an information disclosure procedure at an emergency time for each individual assigned by each individual (e.g., abstract, col., 3, lines 12 - 48), the disclosure procedure executing section receives the request for disclosing the information of the specific

individual (e.g., abstract, col., 3, lines 12 - 48), with attached information for identifying a normal time and an emergency time (e.g., abstract, col., 3, lines 12 - 48), and executes an information disclosure procedure of the specific individual stored in the disclosure procedure storing section that matching the information disclosure procedure at a normal time or the information disclosure procedure at an emergency time (e.g., abstract, col., 3, lines 12 - 48), depending on whether the request for disclosing belongs to the normal time or the emergency time (e.g., abstract, col., 3, lines 12 - 48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Turner, Walker, Alisuag, Marchosky and Platenghe in order to facilitate handling of request at an emergency time because the handled request handled by an individual would support accessing the information of an individual during the emergency time. The support of individual for providing necessary help in emergency situations would benefit of having necessary information for managing individual information.

15. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alisuag in view of Marchosky.

16. As per claim 8, Alisuag discloses a method (e.g., paragraph 9, col., 1) for managing information of users (e.g., clients, figure 3, paragraph 9, col., 1) using an information managing device (e.g., usage of servers, figure 3) connected with a network (e.g., usage of internet, figure 3), comprising:

storing information (e.g., usage of memory, paragraph 12, col., 1) of the users (e.g., clients, figure 3, paragraph 9, col., 1) in association with information disclosure items (e.g., usage of fingerprints, passcode etc., paragraph 12, col., 1);

allowing each of the users (e.g., clients, figure 3, paragraph 9, col., 1) to provide an information disclosure procedure (e.g., usage of fingerprint reader etc., paragraph 9, col., 1) necessary to access respective information (e.g., medical information, figure 5) of each of the users (e.g., clients, figure 3, paragraph 9, col., 1); and

transmitting information (e.g., paragraph 11, col., 1) corresponding to the information disclosure items (paragraph 9, col., 1) of a specific user among the users (e.g., client, figure 3, paragraph 9, col., 1) responsive to an input of an information disclosure procedure (e.g., figure 2, col., 12, col., 1) matching the provided information disclosure procedure (e.g., col., 12, col., 1) corresponding to the specific user (e.g., patient specific authentication information, figure 2).

However, Alisuag does not specifically mention about the items being correspondingly assigned by the users.

Marchosky discloses the well-known concept of the items being correspondingly assigned by the users (paragraph 22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Alisuag with the teachings of Marchosky in order to facilitate the items being correspondingly assigned by the users because the users would have control on what items to be assigned and what items note to be assigned for the information disclosure procedure. The individual would prepare information disclosure procedure according to his/her own needs which would be used by the information managing device.

17. As per claim 9, Alisuag discloses a method (e.g., paragraph 9, col., 1) for managing information of users (e.g., clients, figure 3, paragraph 9, col., 1) using an information managing device (e.g., usage of servers, figure 3) connected with a network (e.g., usage of internet, figure 3), comprising:

storing information (e.g., usage of memory, paragraph 12, col., 1) of a first user (e.g., client, figure 3, paragraph 9, col., 1) and allowing the first user to provide a corresponding disclosure procedure (e.g., usage of fingerprints, passcode etc., paragraph 12, col., 1) which each item of the information is to be accessed (e.g., medical information, figure 5);

executing a corresponding disclosure procedure (figures 3 and 5, paragraphs 9 and 12, col., 1) provided to an item of the information (figures 3 and 5, paragraphs 9 and 12, col., 1) upon receipt of a request from a second user that satisfies the corresponding disclosure procedure provided to the item by the first user (figures 3 and 5, paragraphs 9 and 12, col., 1), and making the item accessible by the second user (figures 3 and 5, paragraphs 9 and 12, col., 1).

However, Alisuag does not specifically mention about the items being assigned by a corresponding user and the information disclosure procedure being assigned by the user.

Marchosky discloses the well-known concept of the items being assigned by a corresponding user (paragraph 22) and the information disclosure procedure being assigned by the user (paragraph 22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Alisuag with the teachings of Marchosky in order to facilitate the items being assigned by a corresponding user and the information disclosure

procedure being assigned by the user because the user would have control on what items to be assigned and what items note to be assigned for the information disclosure procedure. The user would prepare information disclosure procedure according to his/her own needs which would be used for managing information.

18. Claim 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Black, 6,539,101 (Hereinafter Black) in view of Marchosky.

19. As per claim 8, Black discloses a method (e.g., paragraph 18, col., 2) for managing information of users (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2) using an information managing device (e.g., figure 1B) connected with a network (e.g., paragraph 10, col., 1, paragraph 18, col., 2), comprising:

storing information (e.g., usage of memory, paragraph 121, col., 9) of the users (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2) in association with information disclosure items (e.g., usage of fingerprints, voiceprint etc., paragraph 11, col., 1, paragraph 109, col., 9);

allowing each of the users (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2) to provide an information disclosure procedure (e.g., paragraph 28, col.,3) necessary to access respective information (e.g., paragraph 26, col., 3) of each of the users (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2); and

transmitting information corresponding to the information disclosure items (e.g., paragraph 10, col., 1, paragraph 18, col., 2) of a specific user among the users (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2) responsive to an input of an information disclosure procedure (e.g., paragraphs 26, 27, col., 3) matching the provided information disclosure procedure (e.g., paragraph 21, col., 2) corresponding to the specific user (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2).

However, Black does not specifically mention about the items being correspondingly assigned by the users.

Marchosky discloses the well-known concept of the items being correspondingly assigned by the users (paragraph 22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Black with the teachings of Marchosky in order to facilitate the items being correspondingly assigned by the users because the users would have control on what items to be assigned and what items note to be assigned for the information disclosure procedure. The individual would prepare information disclosure procedure according to his/her own needs, which would be used by the information managing device.

20. As per claim 9, Black discloses a method (e.g., paragraph 18, col., 2) for managing information of users (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2) using an information managing device (e.g., figure 1B) connected with a network (e.g., paragraph 10, col., 1, paragraph 18, col., 2), comprising:

storing information (e.g., paragraph 121, col., 9) of a first user (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2) and allowing the first user to provide a corresponding disclosure procedure (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2) which each item of the information is to be accessed (e.g., paragraph 26, col., 3), executing a corresponding disclosure procedure (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2, paragraph 10, col., 1, paragraph 18, col., 2, paragraph 121, col., 9, paragraph 28, col.,3, paragraph 26, col., 3, figure 1B) provided to an item of the information (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2, paragraph 10, col., 1, paragraph 18, col., 2, paragraph 121, col., 9, paragraph 28, col.,3, paragraph 26, col., 3, figure

1B) upon receipt of a request from a second user that satisfies the corresponding disclosure procedure provided to the item by the first user (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2, paragraph 10, col., 1, paragraph 18, col., 2, paragraph 121, col., 9, paragraph 28, col.,3, paragraph 26, col., 3, figure 1B), and making the item accessible by the second user (e.g., paragraph 17, col., 2, paragraph 10, col., 1, paragraph 18, col., 2, paragraph 121, col., 9, paragraph 28, col.,3, paragraph 26, col., 3, figure 1B).

However, Black does not specifically mention about the items being assigned by a corresponding user and the information disclosure procedure being assigned by the user.

Marchosky discloses the well-known concept of the items being assigned by a corresponding user (paragraph 22) and the information disclosure procedure being assigned by the user (paragraph 22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Black with the teachings of Marchosky in order to facilitate the items being assigned by a corresponding user and the information disclosure procedure being assigned by the user because the user would have control on what items to be assigned and what items note to be assigned for the information disclosure procedure. The user would prepare information disclosure procedure according to his/her own needs, which would be used for managing information.

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record (forms PTO-892 and applicant provided IDS cited arts) and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Haresh Patel

December 20, 2005

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100